

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION

AIR VENT, INC., §  
§  
*Plaintiff*, §  
§  
v. § Civil Action No. 3:22-cv-2439-x  
§  
POWERMAX ELECTRIC CO., LTD, §  
§  
*Defendant*. §  
§  
§

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER  
DENYING DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS FOR LACK OF  
PERSONAL JURISDICTION**

Pending before the Court is Defendant Powermax Electrical Co., Ltd., Guandong's ("Powermax") motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction. (Doc. 9). After reviewing the motion, response, reply, and applicable law, the Court **DENIES** Powermax's motion. (Doc. 9).

**I. Background**


This is one of the four Air Vent cases in front of this Court: No. 3:22-CV-0229, No. 3:22-CV-2437, No. 3:22-CV-2793, and No. 3:22-CV-2439. In each of these four cases, Powermax has filed a motion to dismiss plaintiff Air Vent Inc.'s complaint for lack of personal jurisdiction. The Court has authored a memorandum opinion and order analyzing the merits of—and ultimately denying—Powermax's motion in *Air Vent Inc. v. Powermax Electric Co. LTD*, No. 3:22-CV-0229, (Doc. 93) (N.D. Tex.) (Starr. J.).

The facts in this case differ slightly, but none of those differences warrant deviating from the Court's decision in No. 3:22-CV-0229. While this case concerns a different fire occurring in a different state, Air Vent has produced documents in jurisdictional discovery showing that Powermax entered a long-standing relationship knowing that its fans were being shipped to Texas and that the fan in question in this dispute passed through Texas. So while the facts are slightly different, the Court's analysis in No. 3:22-CV-0229 remains unchanged.

## II. Conclusion

Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** Powermax's motion. (Doc. 9).

**IT IS SO ORDERED** this 24th day of January, 2024.



---

BRANTLEY STARR  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE